	Case 3:06-cv-05340-RJB Docume	nt 165 Filed 05/30/07	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
11	AT TACOMA		
1213	RICHARD ROY SCOTT,		
13	Plaintiff,		
15	V.	Case No. C06-53	340RJB
16	AL NERIO et al., ORDER ON PENDING		
17	Defendants.	MOTIONS	NDING
18			
19	This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Civil Rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge		
20	pursuant to Title 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Magistrates' Rules MJR 1, MJR 3, and		
21	MJR 4.		
22	Now before the court are five motions filed by the plaintiff. The motions include:		
23	1. Motion to extend discovery and set a new scheduling order (Dkt. # 132).		
24	 Motion to conduct discovery (Dkt. # 136). A renewed motion to extend the discovery deadline (Dkt. # 137). 		
25	 3. A renewed motion to extend the discovery deadline (Dkt. # 137). 4. Motion for leave to amend the complaint (Dkt. # 138). 		
26	5. Motion to conduct discovery (Dkt. # 143).		
27	The motions relating to discovery, (Dkt. # 132, 136, 137, and 143), are DENIED , except as noted		
28			
	ORDER		
	Page - 1		

below.

Plaintiff's second motion to conduct discovery is accompanied by requests for admissions sent to Al Nerio and John Rockwell (Dkt. # 143). Plaintiff asks each of these defendants to admit the hearing committee was told what to find as to facts and sanctions (Dkt. # 143, attachments). This action challenges a hearing held April 6, 2006. Defendants object and argue the question is duplicative of one already asked defendant Rockwell and answered in plaintiff's written deposition questions. Defendant Nerio is directed to answer this question.

Plaintiff also propounds a request for production of all documents related to his April 6, 2000, hearing (Dkt. # 143). Defendants have objected and note that plaintiff has access to the documents simply by making a request to "SCC staff." The court expects Mr. Scott to first access the records in the manner recommended by defendants.

Plaintiff seeks to amend the complaint (Dkt. # 138). Judge Lasnik set the parameters of this case in the order allowing plaintiff to proceed (Dkt. # 2). The motion is **DENIED.**

The clerk is directed to send a copy of this order to plaintiff and counsel for defendants.

DATED this 29 day of May, 2007.

/S/ J. Kelley Arnold
J. Kelley Arnold
United States Magistrate Judge

ORDEF Page - 2